

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

IN THE UNITED STATE DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15 **Tony Roberts,**

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 **J. Beard et al.,**

19 Defendants.

20 Case No. 15cv1044 WQH PCL

21 **REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION GRANTING
IN PART DEFENDANTS' MOTION
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

22 I. INTRODUCTION

23 Plaintiff Tony Roberts, an inmate currently incarcerated at California Health
24 Care Facility, has filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 lawsuit against staff at the RJ Donovan
25 Correctional Facility for violations of his First Amendment right to file grievances
26 and his Eighth Amendment right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment.

27 (Doc. 1, at 3-4.) Plaintiff alleges that Defendants R. Davis, A. Buenrostro, C. Meza,

1 A. Parker, R. Solis, R. Santiago, L. Ciborowski, D. Arguilez, S. Sanchez, K. Seibel,
2 and Warden D. Paramo all retaliated against him for engaging in First Amendment
3 conduct, and that Defendant Buenrostro sexually assaulted him during a pat-down
4 search in violation of the Eighth Amendment. (Doc. 1, at 11-12.) Defendants have
5 filed a motion for summary judgment on the following grounds: 1) Plaintiff failed
6 to exhaust his administrative remedies as to all claims except the First Amendment
7 retaliation claim against Defendant Buenrostro; 2) the undisputed evidence shows
8 that Defendants did not retaliate against Plaintiff; and 3) the evidence shows that
9 Defendant Buenrostro did not violate his Eighth Amendment rights or violate
10 California law. For the following reasons, the Court recommends granting in part
11 and denying in part Defendants' motion for summary judgment.
12
13 II. ALLEGATIONS
14
15 Plaintiff alleges that "Defendants conspired to retaliate against [him] for
16 engaging in 'protected conduct' when [he] petitioned for redress of his grievances."
17 (Doc. 1, at 19.) Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Davis and Buenrostro "engaged in
18 a series of unlawful and repressive conduct against Plaintiff and other mentally ill
19 inmates" when Plaintiff "attempted to access [RJ Donovan's] inmate appeal
20 procedure to complain about these Defendants' conduct" which "were either
21 screened out or were never responded to by [RJ Donovan's] prison officials." (Doc.
22 1, at 10.) Plaintiff states that after he wrote the "class monitors" of the California
23 Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's mental health delivery system,
24

1 appointed under Coleman v. Brown et al., 28 F. Supp. 3d 1068 (E.D. Cal. April 10,
2 2014), Plaintiff was retaliated against and terrorized by Defendants A. Buenrostro,
3 R. Davis, C. Meza, A. Parker, R. Solis, R. Santiago D. Arguilez, S. Sanchez, L.
4 Ciborowski, K. Seibel, D. Paramo, and Warden J. Beard for engaging in First
5 Amendment conduct. (Doc. 1, at 10-11.)
6
7

8 Plaintiff claims that Defendants C. Meza and A. Buenrostro prohibited
9 Plaintiff's ability to send written communications of public interest to government
10 officials. (Doc. 1, at 19.) Plaintiff states that Defendant C. Meza "illegal[ly]
11 obtained a copy of a written complaint Plaintiff had drafted and submitted" to the
12 Department of Justice and gave the complaint to Defendant Buenrostro, who then
13 concocted false allegations against Plaintiff in retaliation and arranged with other
14 officers Plaintiff's transfer to another prison that caused Plaintiff "to experience an
15 exacerbation in his mental illness." (Doc. 1, at 12.) Plaintiff claims that Defendants
16 A. Parker and A. Buenrostro conducted a cell search and confiscated legal
17 documents from Plaintiff including a civil rights complaint that was about to be
18 filed. (Doc. 1, at 20.) Plaintiff claims that Defendants Davis, Meza, and Buenrostro
19 falsely labeled Plaintiff a "snitch," causing him to be attacked by other inmates, in
20 retaliation for exercising his First Amendment rights. (Doc. 1, at 21-24.) Plaintiff
21 claims that Defendant K. Seibel, the deputy chief warden, conspired to retaliate
22 against Plaintiff for filing grievances by authorizing the illegal activities of the
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 other correctional officers under her and by placing him on a list for transfer to
2 another CDCR facility. (Doc. 1, at 14-15, 23.)
3

4 Finally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Buenrostro conducted a clothed body
5 search of Plaintiff on April 2, 2014 and intentionally rubbed Plaintiff's private parts
6 for sexual gratification in retaliation for exercising his First Amendment rights.
7 (Doc. 1, at 11-12.) Plaintiff also accuses Buenrostro of sexual assault and battery in
8 violation of California law and his Eighth Amendment's rights. (Doc. 1, at 21-23,
9 28.) Plaintiff alleges that on that same day, Buenrostro wrote up a false and
10 retaliatory rules violation report against him for exercising his constitutional rights.
11 (Doc. 1, at 11.)
12

13 **III. EVIDENCE PRESENTED**
14

15 **A. Defendants' Proffer**
16

17 Plaintiff has filed administrative appeals as far back as 1989, and submitted
18 appeals at RJ Donovan every year between 2001 and 2007, before submitting more
19 appeals at RJ Donovan when he was transferred back there in 2014. (Doc. 116,
20 Exhibit B.) Plaintiff has submitted administrative appeals for third-level review
21 since 2005, and submitted approximately nine administrative appeals for third-level
22 review between 2005 and 2014. (Decl. M. Voong, ¶ 10 and Doc. 116, Exhibit A.)
23 In 2014, the year in which all of the events in this lawsuit are alleged to have
24 occurred, Plaintiff properly submitted only two administrative appeals. (Doc. 116,
25 Exhibit A.) In one of them, Log No. RJD-14-1803, Plaintiff appealed the rules
26
27
28

1 violation report authored by Officer Buenrostro on April 2, 2014, and the guilty
2 finding made against him on May 1, 2014, based on that report. (Doc. 116, Exhibit
3 A.) When Plaintiff originally submitted the appeal, Officer Buenrostro was the only
4 Defendant named in it. (Doc. 116, Exhibit A.) The subject matter of this
5 administrative appeal was limited to the rules violation report authored by Officer
6 Buenrostro and the guilty finding made against Plaintiff. (Doc. 116, Exhibit A.)
7 Plaintiff's contention was that Officer Buenrostro filed a "false" rules violation
8 report against him in retaliation for prior grievances. (Doc. 116, Exhibit A.) The
9 administrative appeal did not contain any allegations that Officer Buenrostro
10 improperly searched Plaintiff, intentionally rubbed Plaintiff's private parts for
11 sexual gratification, or any of the other allegations made against Officer Buenrostro
12 in this lawsuit. (Doc. 116, Exhibit A.) After prison officials at RJ Donovan
13 conducted the second-level review of appeal Log No. RJD-14-1803, Plaintiff
14 completed Section F, requesting third-level review. (Decl. B. Self, ¶ 11.) Plaintiff
15 attempted to name other Defendants in this lawsuit, including Captain Sanchez and
16 Associate Warden Siebel, and to add new allegations. (Decl. B. Self, ¶ 11.) Under
17 California regulations, prisoners cannot expand the scope of the appeal and add new
18 issues or individuals after it is originally submitted. (Decl. B. Self, ¶ 11.) Plaintiff
19 did not properly submit any other administrative appeals naming Defendants in
20 2014. (Decl. B. Self, ¶ 12.) Plaintiff submitted approximately seven other
21 administrative appeals at RJ Donovan in 2014 that were screened out or cancelled
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 for various reasons. (Decl. B. Self, ¶ 14.) In most cases, those appeals were
2 screened out because Plaintiff attempted to include multiple issues in the same
3 appeal, because he failed to provide specific names or dates, or because he failed to
4 use the CDCR-22 “Request for Interview” form, where appropriate. (Decl. B. Self ¶
5 14.) In each case, the appeals office issued Plaintiff a screen-out letter explaining to
6 him how he could properly resubmit the appeals. (Decl. B. Self, ¶ 14.) The only
7 administrative appeal that Plaintiff submitted to the Office of Appeals for third-
8 level review in 2014 was Institutional Log No. RJD-14-1803, the one concerning
9 the rules violation report issued by Officer Buenrostro on April 2, 2014. (Decl. M.
10 Voong, ¶ 9.)

14 Defendant Buenrostro declared that he did not take any adverse action against
15 Plaintiff because Plaintiff corresponded with the “class monitors” of CDCR’s
16 mental health delivery system, appointed under Coleman v. Brown et al., or for any
17 other reason. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 2.) Defendant Buenrostro stated that he never
18 refused to process Plaintiff’s outgoing mail and that he never interfered with
19 Plaintiff’s outgoing or incoming mail. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 3.) Defendant
20 Buenrostro was monitoring the inmates in Housing Unit A-1 on April 2, 2014.
21 (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 3.) Defendant Buenrostro ordered Plaintiff to leave the housing
22 unit and go to the dining hall for breakfast or return to his cell, but he stated that
23 Plaintiff ignored his orders. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 3.) Defendant Buenrostro
24 approached Plaintiff and again ordered Plaintiff to leave the housing unit or return
25

1 to his cell and Plaintiff responded, “Don’t worry about what I’m doing, stupid
2 Mexican.” (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 3.) Defendant Buenrostro stated that he searched
3 Plaintiff because Plaintiff’s actions were suspicious and unusual. (Buenrostro Decl.
4 ¶ 4.) Defendant Buenrostro told Plaintiff that Plaintiff is expected to follow orders
5 and procedures within the housing unit. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 4.) Plaintiff was
6 agitated and angry and responded “Fuck you stupid Mexican. I’m going to do what
7 I want to do.” (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 4.) Defendant Buenrostro placed Plaintiff in
8 handcuffs because of Plaintiff’s unusual behavior and agitated state, and as a safety
9 precaution, Plaintiff was escorted to the Program Support Unit. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶
10 4.) Defendant Buenrostro declared that he did not use excessive or improper force
11 on Plaintiff at any time during the incident and clothed body search on April 2,
12 2014. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 5.) Defendant Buenrostro stated that he did not sexually
13 assault Plaintiff during that search and did not rub Plaintiff’s private parts for
14 sexual gratification. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 5.) Defendant Buenrostro searched
15 Plaintiff because his actions were suspicious, and Defendant Buenrostro knew that
16 Plaintiff was not assigned to cell 210. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 5.) Defendant Buenrostro
17 also knew, based on his training, education, and personal experience within CDCR,
18 that inmates often try to go to other cells for improper purposes such as delivering
19 or obtaining contraband including drugs, weapons, currency, or electronic
20 equipment or other property that is not theirs. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 5.) This, and
21 Plaintiff’s agitated state, were the only reasons why Defendant Buenrostro

1 performed a clothed body search of Plaintiff. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 5.) Defendant
2 Buenrostro wrote a 115 Rules Violation Report charging Plaintiff with behavior
3 that leads to violence in violation of California Code of Regulations, Title 15,
4 section 3005(d). (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 6 and Exhibit A.) Defendant Buenrostro stated
5 that he did not write this report in retaliation. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 6 and Exhibit A.)
6 This Rules Violation Report was heard by a senior hearing officer, Correctional
7 Lieutenant R. Davis, on May 1, 2014. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 6 and Exhibit A thereto.)
8 Lt. Davis found Plaintiff not guilty of behavior that leads to violence, but instead
9 found him guilty of the lesser included offense of openly displaying disrespect in
10 violation of California Code of Regulations, Title 15, section 3004 (b). Lt. Davis's
11 finding was based upon a preponderance of the evidence submitted at the hearing.
12 (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 6 and Exhibit A.) This evidence included Defendant
13 Buenrostro's written report which stated in part that Plaintiff said "don't worry
14 about what I'm doing stupid Mexican," and the testimony of Correctional
15 Counselor Hailey, who told Lt. Davis that he heard Plaintiff call Defendant
16 Buenrostro "a Mexican." (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 6 and Exhibit A.) Plaintiff was
17 assessed thirty days forfeiture of good-time credits, thirty days loss of evening yard
18 privileges, and thirty day loss of dayroom privileges. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 6 and
19 Exhibit A.) This 115 Rules Violation Report's guilty finding has not been
20 overturned by the CDCR. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 6 and Exhibit A.)
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Defendant Buenrostro never contacted Sergeant Sanchez to plot Plaintiff's
2 transfer to another prison, knowing that doing so would exacerbate Plaintiff's
3 mental illness. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 8.) Defendant Buenrostro did not have authority
4 to have an inmate transferred, and he had no influence over the decision to transfer
5 an inmate. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 8.) Defendant Buenrostro has never sat on any of
6 Plaintiff's classification committees, nor has he ever acted as a Classification Staff
7 Representative reviewing any action concerning Plaintiff. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 10.)

8 Defendants Buenrostro and Parker did not confiscate a civil rights lawsuit
9 during a search of Plaintiff's cell on June 3, 2014. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 11; Parker
10 Decl. ¶ 2.) Defendants Buenrostro and Parker did not "concoct" false disciplinary
11 charges against Plaintiff. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 12; Parker Decl. ¶ 6.) Defendants
12 Buenrostro and Parker were working as the Floor Officers in Housing Unit A-1 at
13 RJ Donovan on June 3, 2014. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 13; Parker Decl. ¶ 2.) Defendants
14 Buenrostro and Parker randomly chose to search Plaintiff's cell that day.
15
16 (Buenrostro ¶¶ 13, 15; Parker Decl ¶ 2, 4.) Defendant Parker discovered a small,
17 clear plastic bag lying on the lower-bunk mattress underneath a blue, state-issued
18 jacket. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 13; Parker Decl. ¶ 2.) The bag was filled with tobacco.
19
20 (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 13; Parker Decl. ¶ 2.) The lower bunk was assigned to Plaintiff
21 at that time. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 13; Parker Decl. ¶ 2.) Defendant Parker took
22 possession of the tobacco and disposed of it per institutional procedures.
23
24 (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 13; Parker Decl. ¶ 2.) Defendant Parker did not "plant" the bag

1 of tobacco on Plaintiff's bunk. (Parker Decl. ¶ 4.) Defendant Parker wrote a 115
2 Rules Violation Report charging Plaintiff with possession of contraband (tobacco)
3 in violation of California Code of Regulations, Title 15, section 3006. (Buenrostro
4 Decl. ¶ 14; Parker Decl. ¶ 3 and Exhibit A.) This Rules Violation Report was heard
5 by a senior hearing officer, Correctional Lieutenant R. Davis, on July 2, 2014.
6 (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 14; Parker Decl. ¶ 3 and Exhibit A.) Lt. Davis ultimately found
7 Plaintiff not guilty of this charge and dismissed the rules violation report because of
8 insufficient evidence. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 14; Parker Decl. ¶ 3 and Exhibit A.)
9 Defendants Buenrostro and Parker did not search Plaintiff's cell in retaliation for
10 any protected conduct that Plaintiff may have engaged in, or for any other improper
11 reason. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 15; Parker Decl. ¶ 4.) Defendants Buenrostro and
12 Parker searched Plaintiff's cell because they were required to perform three to five
13 random cell searches during their shifts as floor officers. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 15;
14 Parker Decl. ¶ 4.) Defendant Parker did not conspire with Buenrostro, or any other
15 correctional staff member or inmate, to file false disciplinary charges against
16 Plaintiff, and no one ever asked or suggested that Parker do so. (Parker Decl. ¶ 6.)

17 Defendant Buenrostro neither manufactured any charges against Plaintiff at
18 any time, nor has he asked or pressured others to do so. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 20.)
19 Defendant Buenrostro has never taken any adverse action against Plaintiff that was
20 not based upon a legitimate, penological reason. (Buenrostro ¶ 20.) Defendant
21 Buenrostro never told Plaintiff that he would "get some payback" and never

1 attempted to set up Plaintiff to be injured by other inmates. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 22.)
2 Defendant Buenrostro is not aware of any report or instance where Plaintiff was
3 attacked by other inmates from April through October 2014, and he is not aware of
4 any reports evidencing such an attack. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 22.) Defendant
5 Buenrostro has never threatened Plaintiff or bribed or caused another inmate to
6 assault, attack or hurt Plaintiff. (Buenrostro Decl. ¶ 22-24.) Defendant Buenrostro
7 has never called Plaintiff a snitch or child molester at any time. (Buenrostro ¶ 21.)
8 In addition to creating a threat of harm to the inmate and a security risk to the
9 institution, Defendants would have faced severe disciplinary action from their
10 supervisors and the prison administration had they called any inmate a “snitch” or a
11 “child molester.” (Buenrostro ¶ 21.)

12 Defendant Seibel reviewed Plaintiff’s transfer data on CDCR’s Strategic
13 Offender Management System (SOMS). (Seibel Decl. ¶ 5.) SOMS contains data on
14 each CDCR inmate’s case factors. (Seibel Decl. ¶ 5.) The information in SOMS
15 shows that Plaintiff was not placed on a transfer list in September and October 2014
16 to be sent out of RJ Donovan. (Seibel Decl. ¶ 6.) Defendant Seibel does not have
17 unilateral authority to place an inmate on a transfer list. (Seibel Decl. ¶ 6.)
18 Plaintiff’s records showed that RJ Donovan reviewed his case on February 18,
19 2014. (Seibel Decl. ¶ 8.) Plaintiff’s case was referred to the CSR with a
20 recommendation that Plaintiff be retained at RJ Donovan. (Seibel Decl. ¶ 8 and
21 Exhibit A.) The CSR endorsed the UCC’s recommendation on March 26, 2014, and
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Plaintiff remained at RJ Donovan. (Seibel Decl. ¶ 8 and Exhibit B thereto.) This
2 ruling was upheld at Plaintiff's next UCC hearing on September 12, 2014. (Seibel
3 Decl. ¶ 9 and Exhibit C.) Defendant Seibel never had any knowledge that others
4 were planning to retaliate, or were retaliating, against Plaintiff at any time. (Seibel
5 Decl. ¶ 10.)

6

7 **B. Plaintiff's Proffer**

8 On April 2, 2014, Plaintiff placed a CDCR Inmate Appeal 602 dated April 2,
9 2014 in Housing Unit #1 Appeals box, alleging sexual assault by Correctional
10 Officer A. Buenrostro. (Roberts Decl., Doc. 119, at 26.) Plaintiff declared that he
11 never received a response from any prison official regarding the appeal. (Id.)

12 On June 23, 2014, Plaintiff placed a CDCR 602 Appeal dated June 19, 2014
13 concerning senior CDCR administrators' intentional failure to control Officers D.
14 Arguilez, A. Buenrostro, and R. Davis. (Doc. 119, at 27.) Plaintiff declared that he
15 never received a response addressing the appeal. (Id.)

16 On July 8, 2014, Plaintiff gave Officer L. Ciborowski an appeal dated June 28,
17 2014, alleging an ongoing conspiracy to retaliate against him. (Id.) Plaintiff also
18 submitted a CDCR Form 22 Inmate Request for Interview to Officer Ciborowski,
19 who accepted it and signed it. (Id.) However, Plaintiff never received a response to
20 the appeal. (Id.) Plaintiff stated that the administrative appeal submitted to Sergeant
21 Ciborowski on July 8, 2014 included sufficient detail to provide enough
22 information to allow prison officials to take appropriate responsive measures. (Doc.
23

1 119, at 15.) Plaintiff declared that it has been his personal experience that RJ
2 Donovan fails to operate an Inmate Appeal system that conforms to state law and
3 places unreasonable restrictions on inmates' ability to submit 602 appeals. (Roberts
4 Decl. ¶ 16; Doc. 119, at 31.) Plaintiff stated that he believes that his appeals either
5 vanished or were unlawfully rejected. (Roberts Decl. ¶ 17, 23; Doc. 119, at 31-33.)
6
7

8 Plaintiff declared that Officer A. Buenrostro engaged in unlawful and
9 repressive conduct against him as he attempted to access RJ Donvan's inmate
10 appeal procedure to complain about the Defendants' conduct. (Doc. 119, at 33.)
11 Plaintiff stated that Defendant A. Buenrostro refused to process as outgoing mail a
12 Coleman letter to class monitors on March 6, 2014. (Doc. 119, at 34.) Plaintiff then
13 concluded that as a result of his filing 602 appeals and other complaints, he was
14 retaliated against by Defendant Buenrostro, including a sexual assault of his male
15 organ during a pat down search. (Doc. 119, at 35.) Plaintiff stated that Defendant
16 Buenrostro issued him a false 115 Rules Violation Report for behavior that leads to
17 violence arising out of the April 2, 2014 incident. (Doc. 119, at 36.) Plaintiff
18 declared that Defendant Buenrostro falsely accused him of having contraband
19 during the search of his cell on June 3, 2014, an accusation for which he was found
20 not guilty. (Doc. 119, at 38.) Finally, Plaintiff declared that Defendant Buenrostro
21 told inmate Gerald Marshall that Plaintiff was a "snitch," and that he told inmate
22 Curtis Rusher that Plaintiff was a "child molester." (Doc. 119, at 41.)
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Plaintiff submitted a 602 appeal on April 2, 2015 documenting that Defendant
2 Buenrostro threatened Plaintiff with a transfer for engaging in First Amendment
3 conduct. (Doc. 119, at 45-46.) Plaintiff also mentioned Defendants Vasquez, Pena,
4 Warden Paramo, Secretary Beard, and Captain Larson as contributing to the
5 retaliation in their respective capacities. (*Id.*) However, this 602 appeal was rejected
6 at this first level of review on April 24, 2015. (*Id.* at 45.)

7 Plaintiff submitted the declarations of various inmates who also experienced
8 trouble filing grievances. Inmates Wydell Jones, Lewis Law, Dennis Davis, and
9 Jason Coleman all stated that they did not receive responses to their appeals. (Doc.
10 119, at 50-51, 58, 63-64, 66-70.) Inmate William Dawes stated that his appeals
11 were not accepted because he would not answer Defendant Buenrostro's questions
12 about other inmates. (Doc. 119, at 55.)

13 Inmate Juley Gordon stated that Defendant Buenrostro told him that anyone
14 found helping Plaintiff file 602 appeals would be on his hit-list. (Doc. 119, at 83.)
15 Inmate Gerald Marshall declared that Defendant Buenrostro called Plaintiff Roberts
16 a "snitch" and told him the Crips "got off on his ass a couple of months ago on the
17 yard," and told him not to help Plaintiff with his legal papers. (Doc. 119, at 98.)
18 Inmate Curtis Rusher declared that Defendant Buenrostro told him that Plaintiff
19 was arrested for child molestation in the 1980s, offered to provide the documents
20 showing that what he was saying was true, and expressed his desire to see Plaintiff
21 "handled good enough to get him out of here!" (Doc. 119, at 100.) Inmate Keith
22

1 Williams declared that Defendant Buenrostro told him if he and his “homeboys”
2 put Plaintiff “in the hospital this time,” he would bring “anything you want in
3 here.” (Doc. 119, at 103.) Inmate Kelvin Singleton declared that in July 2014,
4 inmates who were West Coast Crip members said a correctional officer offered
5 “five hundred dollars” to “fuck up an EOP inmates named Roberts … for snitching
6 on him and some other officers who had come on A yard from the hole.” (Doc. 119,
7 at 110-111.) He stated that he heard from other inmates that Roberts was attacked
8 during night yard. (Id.)

12 **IV. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

13 **A. General Rule**

14 Rule 56(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure authorizes the granting of
15 summary judgment “if the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and
16 admissions on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine
17 issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to judgment as a
18 matter of law.” The standard for granting a motion for summary judgment is
19 essentially the same as for the granting of a directed verdict. Judgment must be
20 entered, “if, under the governing law, there can be but one reasonable conclusion as
21 to the verdict.” Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 250 (1986). “If
22 reasonable minds could differ,” however, judgment should not be entered in favor
23 of the moving party. Id. at 250-51.

1 The parties bear the same substantive burden of proof as would apply at a trial
2 on the merits, including plaintiff's burden to establish any element essential to his
3 case. Liberty Lobby, 477 U.S. at 252. The moving party bears the initial burden of
4 identifying the elements of the claim in the pleadings, or other evidence, which the
5 moving party "believes demonstrate the absence of a genuine issue of material
6 fact." Celotex v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1986). "A material issue of fact is one
7 that affects the outcome of the litigation and requires a trial to resolve the parties'
8 differing versions of the truth." S.E.C. v. Seaboard Corp., 677 F.2d 1301, 1306 (9th
9 Cir. 1982). More than a "metaphysical doubt" is required to establish a genuine
10 issue of material fact. Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475
11 U.S. 574, 586 (1986).

12 The burden then shifts to the non-moving party to establish, beyond the
13 pleadings, that there is a genuine issue for trial. See Celotex, 477 U.S. at 324. To
14 successfully rebut a properly supported motion for summary judgment, the
15 nonmoving party "must point to some facts in the record that demonstrate a genuine
16 issue of material fact and, with all reasonable inferences made in the plaintiff's]
17 favor, could convince a reasonable jury to find for the plaintiff[]." Reese v.
18 Jefferson School Dist. No. 14J, 208 F.3d 736, 738 (9th Cir. 2000).

19 While the district court is "not required to comb the record to find some reason
20 to deny a motion for summary judgment," Forsberg v. Pacific N.W. Bell Tel. Co.,
21 840 F.2d 1409, 1418 (9th Cir. 1988), the court may nevertheless exercise its
22

1 discretion “in appropriate circumstances,” to consider materials in the record which
2 are on file but not “specifically referred to.” Carmen v. San Francisco Unified Sch.
3 Dist., 237 F.3d 1026, 1031 (9th Cir. 2001). However, the court need not “examine
4 the entire file for evidence establishing a genuine issue of fact, where the evidence
5 is not set forth in the opposing papers with adequate references so that it could be
6 conveniently found.” Id.

7
8 In ruling on a motion for summary judgment, the court need not accept legal
9 conclusions “in the form of factual allegations.” Western Mining Council v. Watt,
10 643 F.2d 618, 624 (9th Cir. 1981). “No valid interest is served by withholding
11 summary judgment on a complaint that wraps nonactionable conduct in a jacket
12 woven of legal conclusions and hyperbole.” Vigliotto v. Terry, 873 F.2d 1201,
13 1203 (9th Cir. 1989).

14
15 Moreover, “[a] conclusory, self-serving affidavit, lacking detailed facts and
16 any supporting evidence, is insufficient to create a genuine issue of material fact.”
17 F.T.C. v. Publ’g Clearing House, Inc., 104 F.3d 1168, 1171 (9th Cir. 1997).
18 Nevertheless, “the district court may not disregard a piece of evidence at the
19 summary stage solely based on its self-serving nature.” Nigro v. Sears, Roebuck &
20 Co., 784 F.3d 495, 497-498 (9th Cir. 2015) (finding plaintiff’s “uncorroborated and
21 self-serving declaration sufficient to establish a genuine issue of material fact
22 because the “testimony was based on personal knowledge, legally relevant, and
23 internally consistent.”).

1 “A trial court can only consider admissible evidence in ruling on a motion for
2 summary judgment.” Orr v. Bank of America, NT & SA, 285 F.3d 764, 773 (9th
3 Cir. 2002). “We have repeatedly held that unauthorized documents cannot be
4 considered in a motion for summary judgment.” Id. “To survive summary
5 judgment, a party does not necessarily have to produce evidence in a form that
6 would be admissible at trial, as long as the party satisfies the requirements of
7 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56.” Block v. City of Los Angeles, 253 F.3d 410,
8 418-419 (9th Cir. 2001). “The court need consider only the cited materials, but it
9 may consider other materials in the record.” FRCP 56(c)(3). “However, a self-
10 serving declaration does not always create a genuine issue of material fact for
11 summary judgment: The district court can disregard a self-serving declaration that
12 states only conclusions and not facts that would be admissible evidence.” Nigro v.
13 Sears, Roebuck and Co., 784 F.3d 495, 497 (9th Cir. 2015) (citations omitted).
14
15 “Mere submission of affidavits opposing summary judgment is not enough; the
16 court must consider whether the evidence presented in the affidavits is of sufficient
17 caliber and quantity to support a jury verdict for the nonmovant. A ‘scintilla of
18 evidence,’ or evidence that is ‘merely colorable’ or ‘not significantly probative,’ is
19 not sufficient to present a genuine issue as to a material fact.” United Steelworkers
20 of America v. Phelps Dodge Corp., 865 F.2d 1539, 1542 (9th Cir. 1989) (citations
21 omitted).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

B. Exhaustion Rule

Section 1997e(a) of the PLRA requires prisoners to exhaust all available administrative remedies before filing a § 1983 action in federal court. See 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a). Congress enacted the PLRA in part to “allow prison officials a chance to resolve disputes regarding the exercise of their responsibilities before being haled into court; to reduce the number of prison suits; and to improve the quality of suits that are filed by producing a useful administrative record.” Garcia v. Miller, 2015 WL 5794552, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 2, 2015). With the passage of the PLRA, the exhaustion requirement was strengthened – it is “no longer left to the discretion of the district court, but is mandatory.” Woodford v. Ngo, 548 U.S. 81, 85 (2006); Ross v. Blake, 136 S. Ct. 1850, 1857 (“[M]andatory exhaustion statutes like the PLRA establish mandatory exhaustion regimes, foreclosing judicial discretion.”). “The obligation to exhaust ‘available’ remedies persists as long as *some* remedy remains ‘available.’ Once that is no longer the case, then there are no ‘remedies ... available,’ and the prisoner need not further pursue the grievance.” Brown v. Valoff, 422 F.3d 926, 935 (9th Cir. 2005) (quoting Booth v. Churner, 532 U.S. 731, 739-41 (2001)). “Failure to exhaust is fatal to a prisoner’s claim.” Bush v. Baca, 2010 WL 4718512, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2010). “Proper exhaustion demands compliance with an agency’s deadlines and other critical procedural rules.” Woodford, 548 U.S. at 90. “The relevant rules governing exhaustion are not defined by the PLRA, ‘but by the prison grievance process itself.’” Ayala v. Fermon, 2017

1 WL 836193, at *5 (S.D. Cal. March 2, 2017) (quoting Jones v. Block, 549 U.S.
2 199, 219 (2007)).
3

4 However, “[a] federal court may nonetheless excuse a prisoner’s failure to
5 exhaust if the prisoner takes ‘reasonable and appropriate steps’ to exhaust
6 administrative remedies but prison officials render administrative relief ‘effectively
7 unavailable.’” Ellis v. Navarro, 2011 WL 845902, at *1 (N.D. Cal. March 8, 2011)
8 (citation omitted). The mandatory exhaustion requirement under the PLRA is
9 excused in three circumstances: (1) when an administrative procedure “operates as
10 a simple dead end – with officers unable or consistently unwilling to provide any
11 relief to aggrieved inmates”; (2) when “an administrative scheme might be so
12 opaque that it becomes, practically speaking, incapable of use”; and (3) when “a
13 grievance process is rendered unavailable when prison administrators thwart
14 inmates from taking advantage of it through machination, misrepresentation, or
15 intimidation.” Ross, 136 S. Ct. at 1853-54.
16

17 The issue of “[e]xhaustion should be decided, if feasible, before reaching the
18 merits of a prisoner’s claim.” Albino v. Baca, 747 F.3d 1162, 1170 (9th Cir. 2014)
19 (en banc). In a summary judgment motion for failure to exhaust, the Ninth Circuit
20 instructs that it is defendant’s burden to use this evidence to “prove that there was
21 an available administrative remedy, and that the prisoner did not exhaust that
22 available remedy.” Albino, 747 F.3d at 1172. “Once the defendant has carried that
23

1 burden, the prisoner has the burden of production. That is, the burden shifts to the
2 prisoner to come forward with evidence showing that there is something in his
3 particular case that made the existing and generally available administrative
4 remedies effectively unavailable to him.” Id. “If undisputed evidence viewed in the
5 light most favorable to the prisoner shows a failure to exhaust, a defendant is
6 entitled to summary judgment under Rule 56.” Id. at 1179. However, “[i]f material
7 facts are disputed, summary judgment should be denied, and the district judge
8 rather than a jury should determine the facts.” Id. at 1166. “[F]actual questions
9 relevant to exhaustion should be decided by the judge, in the same manner a judge
10 rather than a jury decides disputed factual questions relevant to jurisdiction and
11 venue.” Id. at 1170-71. “If ‘summary judgment is not appropriate,’ as to the issue of
12 exhaustion, ‘the district judge may decide disputed questions of fact in a
13 preliminary proceeding.’” Hamilton v. Hart, 2016 WL 1090109, at *4 (E.D. Cal.
14 March 21, 2016) (quoting Albino, 474 F.3d at 1168). “[W]hile parties may be
15 expected to simply reiterate their positions as stated in their briefs, ‘one of the
16 purposes of an evidentiary hearing is to enable [] the finder of fact to see the
17 witness’s physical reactions to the questions, to assess the witness’s demeanor, and
18 to hear the tone of the witness’s voice.’” Hamilton, 2016 WL 1090109, at *4
19 (quoting U.S. v. Mejia, 69 F.3d 309, 315 (9th Cir. 1995)). “All of this assists the
20 finder of fact in evaluating the witness’ credibility.” Hamilton, 2016 WL 1090109,
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 *4. “It is only in rare instances that credibility may be determined without an
2 evidentiary hearing.” Id. (internal citations and quotations omitted).
3

4 V. DISCUSSION
5

6 **A. Plaintiff Failed to Properly Exhaust His Administrative Remedies for**
7 **All Claims Except the Retaliation Claim against Buenrostro.**

8 Defendants have put forth evidence showing that Plaintiff properly submitted
9 only one administrative appeal in 2014 containing any of the allegations in this
10 lawsuit. Plaintiff submitted appeal Log No. RJD-14-1803 on May 19, 2014,
11 contesting the guilty finding made against him on May 1, 2014, concerning a rules
12 violation report authored by Buenrostro on April 2, 2014, which charged Plaintiff
13 with behavior that leads to violence. Plaintiff contended that Buenrostro “falsified”
14 this rules violation report against him for the April 2, 2014 incident, in retaliation
15 for past grievances. Plaintiff argued that he was not guilty of “Openly Displaying
16 Disrespect” toward Buenrostro, which was the finding of the Senior Hearing
17 Officer. (Decl. B. Self, Exhibit A.) Plaintiff’s contentions were rejected, and his
18 disciplinary appeal was denied at both the second and third levels of review. Id.

19 Based on this administrative appeal, and Plaintiff’s contentions within it,
20 Plaintiff exhausted his administrative remedies concerning his claim that
21 Buenrostro retaliated against him by authoring a false rules violation report on
22 April 2, 2014. However, this is the only claim that Plaintiff exhausted. In the
23

1 appeal, Plaintiff did not allege that Buenrostro improperly searched Plaintiff that
2 day or that Buenrostro intentionally touched Plaintiff's private parts for his sexual
3 gratification. Plaintiff made no other claims against any other Defendant in the
4 appeal. Plaintiff tried to add new allegations and name new prison officials in
5 Section F of a subsequent appeal, including Captain Sanchez and Associate Warden
6 Siebel, after appeal RJD-14-1803 was reviewed at the second level. But California
7 regulations are clear that "administrative remedies shall not be considered
8 exhausted relative to any new issue, information, or person later named by
9 appellant that was not included in the originally submitted CDCR Form 602." Cal.
10 Code Regs. Tit. 15, § 3084.1(b) (emphasis added). This is why the Office of
11 Appeals specifically refused to address those new issues in the third level response.
12 (See Exhibit A to Decl. B. Self, third-level response, second paragraph under III,
13 "Third Level Decision," A, "Findings.")

14 The only other administrative appeal Plaintiff properly submitted in 2014 was
15 Log No. RJD-14-1209, which challenged the cancellation of a previous appeal, Log
16 No. RJD-14-1117. RJD-14-1117 concerned funds taken from Plaintiff's trust
17 account. (Decl. B Self, ¶¶ 12-13.) Plaintiff submitted seven other administrative
18 appeals in 2014, which were screened out or cancelled for various reasons. (Decl.
19 B. Self, ¶ 14.) Evidence from the Office of Appeals shows that the only
20 administrative appeal Plaintiff advanced to the third-level of review in 2014 was
21 Log No. RJD-14-1803. (Decl. M. Voong ¶ 9.)

1 Plaintiff did not properly submit any other administrative appeal naming
2 Buenrostro or any other Defendant in 2014. (Decl. B. Self, ¶ 12.)
3

4 **B. Defendants are entitled to summary judgment as to Plaintiff's
5 Exhausted Retaliation Claim Against Buenrostro.**

6 The fundamentals of a retaliation claim are easily summarized. "Within the
7 prison context, a viable claim of First Amendment retaliation entails five basic
8 elements: (1) An assertion that a state actor took some adverse action against an
9 inmate (2) because of (3) that prisoner's protected conduct, and that such action (4)
10 chilled the inmate's exercise of his First Amendment rights, and (5) the action did
11 not reasonably advance a legitimate correctional goal." Rhodes v. Robinson, 408
12 F.3d 559, 567-68 (9th Cir. 2005) (citing Resnick v. Hayes, 213 F.3d 443, 449 (9th
13 Cir. 2000)). It is the plaintiff's burden to prove each of those elements, including the
14 lack of any legitimate correctional goal for the challenged action. Pratt v. Rowland,
15 65 F.3d 802, 806 (9th Cir. 1995). Courts should afford appropriate deference and
16 flexibility to prison officials in the evaluation of proffered legitimate penological
17 reasons for conduct alleged to be retaliatory. Pratt, 65 F.3d at 807. A plaintiff must
18 prove that the alleged retaliatory motive was the but-for cause of the challenged
19 actions. Hartman v. Moore, 547 U.S. 250, 260 (2006).

20 Here, Plaintiff has failed to provide evidence that the alleged retaliatory
21 motive – to chill Plaintiff's First Amendment rights to file grievances – was the but-
22 for cause of Defendant Buenrostro's report stating that Plaintiff openly displayed
23

1 disrespect against him by calling him a “stupid Mexican.” It is a legitimate
2 penological goal to ensure that prisoners respect the correctional officers and that
3 internal order and discipline are maintained. Procurier v. Martinez, 416 U.S. 396,
4 412-413 (1972). Courts must “afford appropriate deference and flexibility” to
5 prison officials in the evaluation of proffered legitimate penological reasons for
6 conduct alleged to be retaliatory.” Pratt v. Rowland, 65 F.3d 802, 807 (9th Cir.
7 1995) (quoting Sandin v. Conner, 515 U.S. 472, 482 (1995)). The evidence shows
8 that there was a legitimate reason for the issuance of the rules violation against
9 Plaintiff, and Plaintiff has not provided any reason to doubt the truth of the prison’s
10 finding him guilty of disrespectful behavior. Thus, Plaintiff’s claim that Defendant
11 Buenrostro “falsified” a rules violation report against him for the April 2, 2014
12 incident, in retaliation for past grievances, should be dismissed on summary
13 judgment.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**C. Plaintiff is Entitled to an Evidentiary Hearing to Determine whether
He Effectively Exhausted His Remedies For His Remaining Claims.**

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

654

655

656

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

678

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787

788

789

790

791

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

816

817

818

819

820

821

822

823

824

825

826

827

828

829

830

831

832

833

834

835

836

837

838

839

840

841

842

843

844

845

846

847

848

849

850

851

852

853

854

855

856

857

858

859

860

861

862

863

864

865

866

867

868

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888

889

890

891

892

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

922

923

924

925

926

927

928

929

930

931

932

933

934

935

936

937

938

939

940

941

942

943

944

945

946

947

948

949

950

951

952

953

954

955

956

957

958

959

960

961

962

963

964

965

966

967

968

969

970

971

972

973

974

975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

987

988

989

990

991

992

993

994

995

996

997

998

999

1000

1 Correctional Officer A. Buenrostro. (Roberts Decl., Doc. 119, at 26.) Plaintiff
2 declared that he never received a response from any prison official regarding the
3 appeal. (Id.) On June 23, 2014, Plaintiff stated that he placed a CDCR 602 Appeal
4 dated June 19, 2014 concerning senior CDCR administrators' intentional failure to
5 control Officers D. Arguilez, A. Buenrostro, and R. Davis. (Doc. 119, at 27.)
6 Plaintiff declared that he never received a response addressing the appeal. (Id.) On
7 July 8, 2014, Plaintiff gave Officer L. Ciborowski an Appeal dated June 28, 2014,
8 alleging an ongoing conspiracy to retaliate against him. (Id.) Plaintiff also
9 submitted a CDCR Form 22 Inmate Request for Interview to Officer Ciborowski,
10 who accepted it and signed it. (Id.) However, Plaintiff never received a response to
11 the appeal. (Id.) Plaintiff stated that the administrative appeal submitted to Sergeant
12 Ciborowski on July 8, 2014 included sufficient detail to provide enough
13 information to allow prison officials to take appropriate responsive measures. (Doc.
14 119, at 15.) Finally, Plaintiff submitted a 602 appeal on April 2, 2015 documenting
15 that Defendant Buenrostro threatened Plaintiff with a transfer for engaging in First
16 Amendment conduct. (Doc. 119, at 45-46.) Plaintiff also mentioned Defendants
17 Vasquez, Pena, Warden Paramo, Secretary Beard, and Captain Larson as
18 contributing to the retaliation in their respective capacities. (Id.) However, this 602
19 appeal was rejected at this first level of review on April 24, 2015. (Id. at 45.)
20

21 Plaintiff declared that it has been his personal experience that RJ Donovan
22 fails to operate an Inmate Appeal system that conforms to state law and places
23

1 unreasonable restrictions on inmates' ability to submit 602 appeals. (Roberts Decl.
2 ¶ 16; Doc. 119, at 31.) Plaintiff stated that he believes that his appeals either
3 vanished or were unlawfully rejected. (Roberts Decl. ¶ 17, 23; Doc. 119, at 31-33.)
4 Plaintiff also submitted the declarations of various inmates who also experienced
5 trouble filing grievances. Inmates Wydell Jones, Lewis Law, Dennis Davis, and
6 Jason Coleman all stated that they did not receive responses to their appeals. (Doc.
7 119, at 50-51, 58, 63-64, 66-70.) Inmate William Dawes stated that his appeals
8 were not accepted because he would not answer Defendant Buenrostro's questions
9 about other inmates. (Doc. 119, at 55.)

10
11
12
13 Because the material facts are disputed as to whether the prison thwarted
14 Plaintiff's ability to file his administrative appeals, summary judgment should be
15 denied at this time and the district judge should hold an evidentiary hearing to
16 decide the disputed factual questions surrounding exhaustion.

17
18 VI. CONCLUSION
19


20 The Court submits this Report and Recommendation to United States District
21 Judge Hayes under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule HC.2 of the United
22 States District Court for the Southern District of California.

23
24 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that any party to this action may file written
25 objections with the Court and serve a copy on all parties no later than **June 13,**
26 **2018.** The document should be captioned "Objections to Report and
27 Recommendation." The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the

1 specified time may waive the right to raise those objections on appeal of the Court's
2 Order. See Turner v. Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998); Martinez v. Ylst,
3 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991).

4
5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**
6
7

8 DATE: May 25, 2018
9
10



11 Peter C. Lewis
12 United States Magistrate Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28